THE Sandy Foundation SHAKEN:

OR,

Thoſe ſo generally believed and applauded DOCTRINES,

Of { One God, ſubſiſting in three diſtinct and ſeparate Perſons, / The impoſſibility of God's pardoning ſinners, without a plenary ſatisfaction, / The juſtification of impure perſons by an imputative Righteouſneſs, } Refuted,

From the Authority of Scripture Teſtimonies, and right Reaſon.

By W. P. j.
A Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved.

But to us there is but one God the Father of all things. 1 Cor. 8. 6.
Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity? He retaineth not his anger for ever, becauſe he delighteth in mercy, Mic. 7. 18.
For I will not juſtifie the wicked, &c. Exod. 23. 7.

London, Printed in the Year, 1684.

DEVONSHIRE HOUSE
Friends' Reference
Library
BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT E.C.

To the Unprejudiced Reader.

IT was the fault of ſome in antient times, that they made void God's Law by mens Traditions; and certainly I may now aſſume the ſame complaint; for whilſt I take a ſerious proſpect of the ſpiritual Nature, and tendency of the Second Covenant, which God Almighty, in the fulneſs of time, by his Prophets, Prophefied to make and perfect; and alſo the accompliſhment thereof by Jeſus Chriſt, and what was brought to paſs amongſt thoſe Primitive Believers; methinks I do not only ſee an utter aboliſhment of Ceremonial Worſhips, but the inſcribing that Spiritual Law on the Heart, and infuſion of Holy Fear to the inward Parts, whereby each perſon became capacitated to know ſo much of God, as ſuited with his preſent ſtate, from an infallible demonſtration in himſelf, and not on the ſlender grounds of mens Lo-here-Interpretations, or Lo-there; for the Kingdom of God is within, where himſelf muſt be the Teacher of his People: but on the other hand, when from the noiſe of every parties pretentions to, and contentions for their own way, as moſt infallible, I am induced to an impartial examination of them; Alas! how have all adulterated from the purity both of Scripture Record, and Primitive Example? receiving for unqueſtionable Doctrines, the fallible apprehenſions, and uncertain determinations of ſuch Councils, whoſe Faction, Prejudice, and Cruelty ſoon paralled the foregoing Heathniſh Perſecutions; and yet that the reſults of perſons ſo incompetently qualified, ſhould at this day in their authority remain unqueſtioned by the Nations, is matter both of aſtoniſhment and pitty; but an implicit Faith has ever been the conſequence of ignorance, idleneſs and fear, being ſtrong impediments to a judicious inquiry, how far profeſt and im-

posed Opinions have their consistency with Reason, and the true Religion. But that which most of all deserves a lamentation, is, that Protestants, *whose better Arguments have confuted the Plea of such as made Tradition, and mens Prescriptions unquestionable in Circumstantials, should themselves by Print and Practice so openly declare and contend for its Authority in Essentials; as must be obvious to any that observe their zealous* Anathema's *against whomsoever refuse a compliance with them in Doctrines, manifestly bottom'd upon mens nice Inventions.*

This is the right state of the Controversie that is maintained by us (contemptibly called Quakers) *against the World, and the undoubted reason of our severe Treatment at its hands, the end of God Almighties raising us, being for no other purpose than to declare that* which our Eyes have seen, our Ears heard, and which our Hands have handled of the Eternal Word, *in opposition to the private Opinions, Conjectures, and Interpretations of men concerning God and Religion, that all people might thereby be reduced to Faith in, and obedience of the Universal* Grace which brings Salvation; *which as it only can restore sound Judgment concerning God, and effect Redemption from Iniquity, so its being relinquish'd by men, was the very ground both of their division in Judgment, and corruption in Manners.*

That this hath been, and is our case, I shall produce an instance, which is indeed the occasion of this Treatise.

Two Persons lately of Tho. Vincent's *Auditory in* Spittle-Yard (*who goes under the notion of a* Presbyter) *being desirous to prove all things, and to hold fast the best, visited our Meeting, to understand if we were as really deserving blame, as represented by our Enemies; where it then pleased Divine Goodness to visit them with the Call of his Light, from the Inventions, carnal Observations, will-Worship, and vein Conversation of those to whom they were formerly related, that they might be made Children of the day; and though its appearance*

might

might be ſmall, yet ſufficient to diſcover them to have been Inhabitants of the Night, and can never be rejected, but it ſhall bring that condemnation which will further teſtifie it to be of God.

But their relinquiſhing his Congregation, ſo incen'd this Presbyterian *Preacher, as that his peeviſh Zeal tranſported him beyond, not only the moderation of Chriſtianity, but the civility of Education, venting his Folly and Prejudice much to this purpoſe,* That he had as lieve they ſhould go to a Bawdy-houſe, as to frequent the *Quakers* Meeting, becauſe of their erroneous and damnable Doctrines: *And pointing to the Window, ſaid,* If there ſhould ſtand a Cup of Poyſon, I would rather drink it, than ſuck in their damnable Doctrines. *He further expreſt himſelf in this manner to one of them;* If ever you go again, I will give you up, and God will give you up, that you may believe a lie, and be damn'd. *Which ſtorms of foul and railing accuſations, proving ineffectual to ſhipwrack that little grain of Faith, his Hearers, as forgetting they hold their Preaching by connivance, and the many Appeals made by their non-conforming Brethren, for an Indulgence, came with this Caution to the* Pater-Familias, *(or he that was both Husband and Father to the concerned Parties) that he would exerciſe his Authority, as well to refuſe them to all* Quaker-*Viſitants, as prohibit them the liberty of their Conſciences in frequenting our Meetings.*

All which we could not for the Truth-ſake let paſs in ſilence, and therefore did require him to let us have a publick Meeting, in which we might have liberty to anſwer on the behalf both of our ſelves and Principles; which after ſome demur, was granted, the Day he appointed, and at the ſecond hour in the afternoon. But that he might not want the applauſe of many voices, and doubtleſs to prevent our Friends, (as I am informed) beſpoke his uſual Auditory to be there at One; and as a man that would not over-ſpend himſelf, or incur a non-plus for want of Seconds, he had his Third and Fourth, to wit, Tho. Danſon, Tho. Doolittel, *and*—Maddocks, *who at their times (and often out*

of

f them) did interpoſe, to whom Geo. Whitehead *moſtly anſwered; nor had there any thing been ſpoken by another, but from their own example.*

The matter in controverſie will be related in the beginning of this Treatiſe, as a neceſſary Preludium, or Introduction to the following Diſcourſe; The manner of it was ſo groſs, that I know not how to repreſent it better, than by the levity and rudeneſs of ſome Prize; Laughing, Hiſſing, Shooving, Striking, and ſtigmatizing us with the opprobrious tearms of Confident Fellow, impudent Villain, Blaſphemer, &c. And, as the uſual refuge of ſhallow Perſons (when they have little elſe to ſay, to prepoſſeſs their Hearers with prejudice againſt the Principles of ſuch as do oppoſe them) he queſtioned much whether I was not ſome Jeſuite; *Not remembring, or at leaſt unwilling to let the people know, that none have been, nor are more inſtant in the vindication of that Doctrine he and his Brethren did aſſert, (to wit,* God ſubſiſting in three diſtinct perſons) *than the* Jeſuites; *So that, if I ſhould not as well reflect a Scandal upon their Learning by a compariſon, as he did upon my Principle, I could more truly invert Jeſuitiſm upon himſelf: In ſhort, they neither would keep to Scripture terms themſelves, nor ſuffer it in others; but looking upon* G. Whitehead's *explanation of their Tearms, and reduction of their Matter (if poſſible) to a Scripture ſenſe (thereby fitting it to the Auditors apprehenſion) to be an indirect way of anſwering (as that which nakedly did expoſe their tradition all folly to the vulgar)* T. V. *in an abrubt manner fell to his Prayer, in which he falſly, and with many ſtrangely affected whines, accuſed us for Blaſphemers unto God; and that he might prevent the clearing of our ſelves, he deſired the people, when he had finiſh'd, to be gone, giving them an example by his and three Brethrens retreat: But we being deſirous further to inform the people of our Innocency, they did not only (as before) endeavour to pull us down, but put the Candles out, though ſeveral perſons of good eſteem, continued,*

whilſt

whilſt we ſpoke in vindication of our ſelves, from the invective of our Adverſaries.

The people ſtill remaining undiſperſed, T. V. *came very palely down the Stairs (having a Candle in his hand) requiring their diſmiſs, at which time he promiſed us, at our requeſt, another meeting; but as one that knew not well what he ſaid, or never purpos'd to perform what he promis'd, has given us ſince to underſtand, he can't in Conſcience ſpare us ſo much time; yet to ſatisfie* G. W. *and my ſelf, in private, he could agree; which ſurely can't be tearm'd another meeting, ſince then it muſt relate to the preceeding one; But how near the relation is betwixt an accuſation before hundreds, and a ſatisfaction before none, muſt needs be obvious to every unbyas'd perſon: — Our Right ſhould have been altogether as publick as our Wrong: — For which cauſe we were neceſſitated to viſit his Meeting; where on a Lecture day (after a continued ſilence during all his Worſhip) we modeſtly intreated we might be clear'd from thoſe unjuſt Reflections before his Congregation, leaving a Diſputation (if he could not then attend it) to ſome more ſeaſonable opportunity: But as one, who reſolv'd Injuſtice to mens reputation, as well as cowardize, in baulking a defence of his own Principles, he ſlunk moſt ſhamefully away; nor would any there, though urg'd to it, aſſume his place to vindicate his practice towards us, or his Doctrine then deliver'd.*

Reader, What's thy Opinion of this ſavage entertainment? Would Socrates, Cato, *or* Seneca *have treated us with ſuch unſeemly carriage, whom they call* Heathens? *I ſuppoſe not: And well is it for the truly ſober and conſcientious, they are not liable to thoſe ſevere laſhes, and that peeviſh uſage, which are the inſeparable Appendix to a* Scotch *Directory, whoſe cold and cutting gales ever have deſign'd to nip and blaſt the faireſt Bloſſoms of greater Reformation. So much for Hiſtory.*

And what remains, is to inform the Reader, that with great brevity I have diſcuſt and endeavoured a total enervation of

thoſe

thoſe Cardinal Points, and chief Doctrines ſo firmly believed, and continually impos'd for Articles of Chriſtian Faith; 1. The Trinity of ſeperate Perſons, in the Unity of Eſſence. 2. God's incapacity to forgive without the fulleſt ſatisfaction paid him by another. 3. A juſtification of impure perſons, from an imputative Righteouſneſs. *Which Principles let me tell thee, Reader, are not more repugnant to Scripture, Reaſon, and Souls-Security, than moſt deſtructive to God's Honour, in his* Unity, Mercy, *and* Purity.

Therefore I beſeech thee to exterminate paſſion from her predominacy, in the peruſal of this abridg'd Diſcourſe, ſince it was writ in love to thee; that whilſt 'tis thy deſire to know Love, and fear God Almighty above mens Precepts, thou mayſt not miſs ſo good an end, by the blind embraces of Tradition for Truth. But in the nobility of a true Berean, *ſearch and inquire; letting the good old Verity, not a pretended Antiquity, (whilſt a meer novelty;) and ſolid Reaſon, not an over-fond credulity, ſway the ballance of thy Judgment, that both ſtability and certainty may accompany thy determinations. Farewel.*

A short Confutation, by way of Recapitulation, of what was objected against us at Thomas Vincent his Meeting.

BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT E.C.

IF Disputations prove at any time ineffectual, it's either to be imputed to the Ignorance and Ambiguity of the Disputants, or to the Rudeness and Prejudice of the Auditory: All which may be truly affirmed of *T.V.* with his three Brethren, and Congregation.

The accusation being general, *viz. That the* Quakers *held Damnable Doctrines*: *George Whitehead* on their behalf stood up, and as it was his place, willingly would have given the people an information of our Principles, which if objected against, he was as ready to defend them by the authority of Scripture and Reason: but instead of this better Mthod, *T.V.* as one that's often employ'd in Catechistical Lectures, falls to Interrogatories, Begging that himself, he in his slander had taken for granted, to wit, the knowledge of our Principles.

The Question was this, *Whether we own'd one God-head, subsisting in Three Distinct and Separate Persons*, as the result of various revises and amendments; which being denyed by us, as a Doctrine no where Scriptural, *T.V.* frames this Sylogism from the beloved Disciples words.

There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.

These are either three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, or three somethings else besides Subsistences.

But they are not three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, nor three any thing else besides Subsistences:

Ergo, *Three Subsistences.*

G.W. Utterly rejected his tearms, as not to be found in Scripture, nor deduceable from the place he instanced: Wherefore he desires their explanation of their Tearms, inasmuch as God did not use to wrap his Truths up in Heathenish Metaphysicks, but in plain Language: Notwithstanding we could not obtain a better explication then Person, or of Person, then the Mode of a Substance; To all which *G.W.* and my self urged several Scriptures, proving Gods compleat Unity: And when we queried how God was to be understood, if in an abstractive sence from his Subsistences: That concluded it a point more fit for Annihilation than Disputation. But a little review his Syllogism; the manner of it shews him as little a Scholar, as the matter does a Christian? but I shall over-look the first, and so much of

thoſe Cardinal Points, and chief Doctrines ſo firmly believed, and continually impos'd for Articles of Chriſtian Faith; 1. The Trinity of ſeperate Perſons, in the Unity of Eſſence. 2. God's incapacity to forgive without the fulleſt ſatisfaction paid him by another. 3. A juſtification of impure perſons, from an imputative Righteouſneſs. *Which Principles let me tell thee, Reader, are not more repugnant to Scripture, Reaſon, and Souls-Security, than moſt deſtructive to God's Honour, in his* Unity, Mercy, *and* Purity.

Therefore I beſeech thee to exterminate paſſion from her predominacy, in the peruſal of this abridg'd Diſcourſe, ſince it was writ in love to thee; that whilſt 'tis thy deſire to know Love, and fear God Almighty above mens Precepts, thou mayſt not miſs ſo good an end, by the blind embraces of Tradition for Truth. But in the nobility of a true Berean, *ſearch and inquire; letting the good old Verity, not a pretended Antiquity, (whilſt a meer novelty;) and ſolid Reaſon, not an over-fond credulity, ſway the ballance of thy Judgment, that both ſtability and certainty may accompany thy determinations. Farewel.*

A short Confutation, by way of Recapitulation, of what was objected against us, at Thomas Vincent *his Meeting.*

BISHOPSGATE WITHOUT E.C.

IF Disputations prove at any time ineffectual, it's either to be imputed to the Ignorance and Ambiguity of the Disputants, or to the Rudeness and Prejudice of the Auditory: All which may be truly affirmed of *T.V.* with his three Brethren, and Congregation.

The accusation being general, *viz. That the* Quakers *held Damnable Doctrines*: *George Whitehead* on their behalf stood up, and as it was his place, willingly would have given the people an information of our Principles, which if objected against, he was as ready to defend them by the authority of Scripture and Reason: but instead of this better Mthod, *T.V.* as one that's often employ'd in Catechistical Lectures, falls to Interrogatories, Begging that himself, he in his slander had taken for granted, to wit, the knowledge of our Principles.

The Question was this, *Whether we own'd one God-head, subsisting in Three Distinct and Separate Persons*, as the result of various revises and amendments; which being denyed by us, as a Doctrine no where Scriptural, *T.V.* frames this Sylogism from the beloved Disciples words.

There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. John 7.

These are either three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, or three somethings else besides Subsistances.

But they are not three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, nor three any thing else besides Subsistences:

Ergo, *Three Subsistences.*

G. W. Utterly rejected his tearms, as not to be found in Scripture, nor deduceable from the place he instanced: Wherefore he desires their explanation of their Tearms, inasmuch as God did not use to wrap his Truths up in Heathenish Metaphysicks, but in plain Language: Notwithstanding we could not obtain a better explication then Person, or of Person, then the Mode of a Substance; To all which *G. W.* and my self urged several Scriptures, proving Gods compleat Unity: And when we queried how God was to be understood, if in an abstractive sence from his Substance: They concluded it a point more fit for Admiration than Disputation. But a little to review his Syllogism; the manner of it shews him as little a Scholar, as its matter does a Christian? but I shall over-look the first, and so much of the

 second,

second, as might deserve my Objection to his *Major*, and give in short my Rason, why I flatly deny his *Minor* Proposition. No one Substance can have three distinct Subsistances, and preserve its own Unity: For granting them the most favourable definition, every subsistence will have its own Substance; so that three distinct Subsistences, or manner of Beings, will require three distinct Substances or Beings; consequently three Gods. For if the infinite God-head subsists in three separate manner or forms, then is not any one of them a perfect and compleat subsistence without the other two; so parts, and something finite is in God: Or if infinite, then three distinct infinite Subsistances; and what's this but to assert three Gods, since none is infinite but God? And on the contrary, there being an inseparability betwixt the Substance and its subsistence, the Unity of Substance will not admit a Trinity of incommunicable or distinct Subsistances.

T. D. being ask'd of whom was Christ the express Image, from his alleadging that Scripture in the *Hebrews*? answered, of Gods Subsistance, or manner of being: From whence two things in short follow as my Reply, It makes God a Father only by Subsistance, and Christ a Son without a Substance. Besides it's falsly rendred in the *Hebrews*, since the Greek does not say καρακτὴρ προσωπου, but κεραμτὴρ τῆς ἴσως ἀσεως, the Character of Substance.

Heb. 1.

And if he will peruse a farther discovery of his Error, and explanation of the Matter, let him read *Col.* 1. 15. *Who is the Image of the Invisible God*

And because *G. W.* willing to bring this strange Doctrine to the capacity of the People, compar'd their three Persons to three Apostles, saying, he did not understand how *Paul*, *Peter*, and *John* could be three Persons, and one Apostle, (a most apt comparison to detect their Doctrine) one—*Maddocks*, whose Zeal out-stript his knowledge, bussing hard, as one that had some necessary matter for the decision of our Controversie, instead thereof (perhaps to save his Brethren, or show himself) silences our farther controverting of the Principle, by a Syllogistical, but impertinent reflection upon *G. W.* his Person. It runs thus, *He that scornfully and reproachfully compares our Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit, one in Essence, but three in Persons, to three finite men, as* Paul, Peter, *and* John, *is a Blasphemer. But you* G. W. *have so done.* Ergo.——

A strange way of Argumentation, to beg what can't be granted him, and take for granted what still remains a Question, *viz.* That there are three distinct and separate Persons in one Essence: Let them first prove their Trinity, and then charge their Blasphemy: But I must not forget this persons self-confutation, who to be plainer, called them three *Hee's*, and if he can find a *He* without a Substance, or prove that a subsistence is any other than the form of a *He*, he would do well to justifie himself from the imputation of Ignorance.

And till their Hipothesis be of better Authority, G. W. neither did, nor does by that Comparison design mens Invention so much honour.

For 'tis to be remark'd, that G. W. is no otherwiſe a Blaſphemer, than by drawing direct conſequences from their own Principles, and recharging them upon themſelves: So that he did not ſpeak his own apprehenſions by his Compariſon, but the ſence of their Aſſertion, therefore Blaſphemer and Blaſphemy are their own.

The Trinity of Diſtinct and Separate Perſons in the Unity of Eſſence, refuted from Scripture.

AND he ſaid, Lord God, there is no God like unto THEE: To whom 1 *King* 8.
then will ye liken ME? Or ſhall I be equal, ſaith the Holy ONE? —*I* 23.
am the Lord, and there is NONE elſe, there is no God beſides Me. Thus ſaith *Iſa.* 40.25.
ſaith the Lord thy Redeemer, the Holy ONE of Iſrael. *I will alſo praiſe THEE,* c. 45. 5,6.
O my God; unto THEE will I ſing, O Holy ONE of Iſrael. * *Jehovah is* c. 48. 17.
ONE, and his Name ONE. Which with the Cloud of other Teſtimo- *Pſ.* 71. 22.
nies that might be urg'd, evidently demonſtrate, that in the days of the firſt Covenant, and Prophets, but ONE was the Holy God, and God but *Zac.* 14. 9.
that Holy ONE.—Again, *And Jeſus ſaid unto him, Why calleſt thou me good?* *Mat.* 19.
there is none good but ONE, and that is God. And this is Life Eternal, that they 17.
might know THEE (Father) *the ONLY true God. Seeing it is ONE God that* *Feb.* 17. 8.
ſhall juſtifie. There be gods many, but unto us there is but ONE God, the Father, *Rom.* 3.
of whom are all things. ONE God and Father who is above all things. For there 30.
is ONE God. To the ONLY Wiſe God be glory now and ever. From all which *1 Cor.* 8. 6.
I ſhall lay down this one Aſſertion, that the Teſtimonies of Scripture, both *Eph.* 4. 6.
under the Law, and ſince the Goſpel-Diſpenſation, declare ONE to be *1 Tim.* 2. 5.
God, and God to be ONE, on which I ſhall raiſe this Argument; *Jude* 25.

If God, as the Scriptures teſtifie, hath never been declar'd or believ'd, but as the Holy ONE, then will it follow, that God is not a Holy THREE, nor doth ſubſiſt in THREE diſtinct and ſeparate Holy ONES; but the before-cited Scriptures undeniably prove that ONE is God, and God only is that Holy ONE; therefore he can't be divided into, or ſubſiſt in a Holy THREE, or THREE diſtinct and ſeparate Holy ONES.—Neither can this receive the leaſt prejudice from that frequent but impertinent diſtinction, that he is ONE in Subſtance, but THREE in Perſons or Subſiſtences; ſince God was not declared or believed incompleatly, or without his ſubſiſtance: Nor did he require homage from his Creatures, as an incompleat or abſtracted being, but as God the Holy ONE; For ſo he ſhould be manifeſted and worſhipped without that which was abſolutely neceſſary to himſelf; ——————————So that either the Teſtimonies of of the aforementioned Scriptures are to be believ'd concerning God, that

he is intirely and compleatly, not abſtractly and diſtinctly, the Holy ONE, or elſe their Authority to be denyed by theſe Trinitarians: And on the contrary, if they pretend to credit their Holy Teſtimonies, they muſt neceſſarily conclude their kind of Trinity a Fiction.

Refuted from right Reaſon.

1. If there be three diſtinct and ſeparate Perſons, then three diſtinct and ſeparate Subſtances, becauſe every perſon is inſeparable from its own Subſtance; and as there is no perſon that's not a Subſtance in common acceptation among men, ſo do the Scriptures plentifully agree herein: And ſince the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God (which their Opinion neceſſitates them to confeſs) then unleſs the Father, Son, and Spirit, are three diſtinct Nothings, they muſt be three diſtinct Subſtances, and conſequently three diſtinct Gods.

2. It's farther prov'd, if it be conſider'd, that either the Divine Perſons are finite or infinite; if the firſt, then ſomething finite is inſeparable to the infinite Subſtance, whereby ſomething finite is in God; If the laſt, then three diſtinct Infinites, three Omnipotents, three Eternals, and ſo three Gods.

3. If each Perſon be God, and that God ſubſiſts in three Perſons, then in each Perſon are three Perſons or Gods, and from three, they will increaſe to nine, and ſo *ad infinitum*.

4. But if they ſhall deny the three Perſons, or Subſiſtences to be infinite, (for ſo there would unavoidably be three Gods) it will follow that they muſt be finite, and ſo the abſurdity is not abated from what it was; for that of one ſubſtance having three ſubſiſtences, is not greater, then that an infinite Being ſhould have three finite modes of ſubſiſting. But though that mode which is finite can't anſwer to a ſubſtance that's infinite; yet to try if we can make their Principle to conſiſt; Let us conceive that three perſons, which may be finite ſeparately, make up an infinite conjunctly; however this will follow, that they are no more incommunicable or ſeparate, nor properly ſubſiſtences, but a ſubſiſtance; for the infinite Subſtance can't find a bottom or ſubſtance in any one or two, therefore joyntly. And here I am alſo willing to over-look finiteneſs in the Father, Son, and Spirit, which this Doctrine muſt ſuppoſe.

5. Again, if theſe three diſtinct Perſons are one, with ſome one thing, as they ſay they are with the God-head, then are not they incommunicable among themſelves; but ſo much the contrary, as to be one in the place of another. For if that the only God is the Father, and Chriſt be that only God, then is Chriſt the Father. So if that one God be the Son, and the Spirit that one God, then is the Spirit the Son, and ſo round. Nor is it

poſſible

possible to stop, or that it should be otherwise, since if the Divine Nature be inseparable from the three Persons, or communicated to each, and each Person have the whole Divine Nature, then is the Son in the Father, and the Spirit in the Son, unless that the God-head be as incommunicable to the Persons, as they are reported to be amongst themselves; or that the three Persons have distinctly allotted them such a proportion of the Divine Nature, as is not communicable to each other; which is a like absurd Much more might be said to manifest the gross contradiction of this Trinitarian Doctrine, as vulgarly receiv'd; but I must be brief.

Information and Caution.

Before I shall condclude this Head, it's requisite I should inform Thee Reader, concerning its Original: Thou may'st assure thy self, it's not from the Scriptures, nor Reason, since so expresly repugnant; although all Broachers of their own Inventions strongly endeavour to reconcile them with that Holy Record. Know then, my Friend, 'twas born above three hundred years after the Antient Gospel was declared; and that through the nice distinctions, and too daring curiosity of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, who being as hotly opposed by *Arrius*, their Zeal so reciprocally blew the fire of Contention, Animosity, and Persecution, till at last they sacrific'd each other to their mutual revenge.

Thus it was conceived in ignorance, brought forth and maintain'd by cruelty; for though he that was strongest, impos'd his Opinion, persecuting the contrary, yet the Scale turning on the Trinitarian side, it has there continued through all the Romish Generations: And notwithstanding it hath obtain'd the name of *Athanasian* from *Athanasius*, an Stiff (witness his carriage towards *Constantine* the Emperor) because suppos'd to have been most concerned in the framing that Creed in which this Doctrine is asserted; yet have I never seen one Copy void of a suspition, rather to have been the results of Popish School-men, which I could render more perspicuous, did not brevity necessitate me to an omission.

Be therefore caution'd, Reader, not to imbrace the determination of prejudic'd Councils, for Evangelical Doctrine; to whom the Scriptures bear no certain testimony; neither was believ'd by the Primitive Saints, or thus stated by any I have read of in the first, second, or third Centuries; particularly *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, with many others who appear wholly forreign to the matter in controversie.—But seeing that private Spirits, and those none of the most ingenious, have been the Parents and Guardians of this so generally receiv'd Doctrine; let the time past suffice, and be admonish'd to apply thy mind unto that Light and Grace which bring Salvation; that by obedience thereunto, those mists

Tradition

Tradition hath cast before thy eyes, may be expel'd, and thou receive a certain knowledge of that God, whom to know is Life Eternal, not to be divided, but ONE pure intire and eternal Being; who in the fulness of time sent forth his Son, as the true Light which enlightneth every man; that whosoever follow'd him (the Light) might be translated from the dark Notions, and vain Conversations of men, to this Holy Light, in which only sound Judgment and eternal Life are obtainable: Who so many hundred years since, in Person testified the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all such a proportion, as may enable them to follow his Example.

The Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction, being dependent on the Second Person of the Trinity, refuted from Scripture.

Doctr. *THat man having transgress'd the Righteous Law of God, and so expos'd to the penalty of eternal Wrath, it's altogether impossible for God to remit or forgive without a Plenary satisfaction; and that there was no other way by which God could obtain satisfaction, or save men, then by inflicting the penalty of infinite wrath and vengeance on Jesus Christ the Second Person of the Trinity, who for sins past, present, and to come, hath wholly born and paid it,* (whether for all or but some) *to the offended infinite justice of his Father.*

Exod. 34. 7. 1. *And the Lord passed by before him,* (Moses) *and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin.* [From whence I shall draw this Position, that since God has proclaim'd himself a Gracious, Merciful, and forgiving God, it's not inconsistent with his Nature to remit, without any other consideration than his own Love: Otherwise he could not justly come under the imputation of so many gracious *Attributes*, with whom it is impossible to pardon, and necessary to exact the payment of the utmost farthing.]

2 Chron. 30. 7. 2. *For if ye turn again to the Lord, the Lord your God is gracious and merciful, and will not turn away his face from you.* [Where how natural is it to observe that God's remission is grounded on their repentance; and not that it's impossible for God to pardon, without a Plenary satisfaction, since the possibility, nay, certainty of the contrary, *viz.* his Grace and Mercy, is the great Motive or Reason of that loving invitation to return.]

Neh. 9. 16. 3. *They hardened their Necks, and hearkned not to thy Commandments, but thou art a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful.* [Can the honest hearted

hearted Reader conceive that God should be thus mercifully qualified, whilst executing the rigor of the Law transgreſt, or not acquitting without the Debt be paid him by another? I ſuppoſe not.

4. *Let the wicked forſake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.* [Come let the unprejudiced judge, if this Scripture Doctrine is not very remote from ſaying his Nature cannot forgive ſin, therefore let Chriſt pay him full ſatisfaction, or he will certainly be avenged; which is the ſubſtance of that ſtrange Opinion.] *Iſa.* 55. 7.

5. *Behold, the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael; *I will put my Law in their inward Parts; I will forgive their Iniquity, and I will remember their Sin no more.* [Here is God's meer Grace aſſerted, againſt the pretended neceſſity of a ſatisfaction to procure his Remiſſion: And this *Paul* acknowledgeth to be the diſpenſation of the Goſpel, in his eighth Chapter to the *Hebrews*: So that this New Doctrine doth not only contradict the Nature and Deſign of the ſecond Covenant, but ſeems in ſhort to diſcharge God both from his Mercy and Omnipotence.] *Jer.* 31. 31, 33, 34.

6. *Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth Iniquity, and paſſeth by the tranſgreſſion of the Remnant of his Heritage? He retaineth not his Anger for ever, becauſe he delighteth in Mercy.* [Can there be a more expreſs paſſage to clear, not only the poſſibility, but real inclinations in God to pardon Sin, and *not retain his anger for ever*; ſince the Prophet ſeems to challenge all other Gods to try their excellency by his God: Herein deſcribing the ſupremacy of his Power, and ſuperexcellency of his Nature, *that he pardoneth Iniquity, and retaineth not his Anger for ever*: So that if the Satisfactioniſts ſhould ask the Queſtion, Who is a God like unto ours, that cannot pardon Iniquity, nor paſs by Tranſgreſſion, but retaineth his Anger until ſome-body make him ſatisfaction? I anſwer, Many amongſt the harſh and ſevere Rulers of the Nation; but as for my God, he is exalted above them all, upon the Throne of his Mercy, *who pardoneth iniquity, and retaineth not his anger for ever, but will have compaſſion upon us.*] *Micb.* 7. 18.

7. *And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.* [Where nothing can be more obvious than that which is forgiven, is not paid: And if it is our duty to forgive without a ſatisfaction received, and that God is to forgive us as we forgive them, then is a ſatisfaction totally excluded: Chriſt further paraphraſes upon that part of his Prayer, *v.* 14. *For if ye forgive their Treſpaſſes, your Heavenly Father will alſo forgive you.* Where he as well arrides the equity of God's forgiving them, from their forgiving others, as he encourages them to forgive others, from the example of God's Mercy in forgiving them: Which is more amply expreſt in *chap.* 18. where the Kingdom of Heaven (that conſiſts *in Righteouſneſs*) is repreſented by a King; *Who upon his Debtors Petition, had compaſſion, and forgave him*; *but the ſame treating his fellow Servant without the leaſt forbearance, the King condemned his unrighteouſ-* *Mat.* 6. 12.

neſs, and delivered him over to the Tormenters. But how had this been a fault in the Servant, if his Kings Mercy had not been propoſed for his Example? How moſt unworthy therefore is it of God, and blaſpemous, may I juſtly tearm it, for any to dare to aſſert that forgiveneſs impoſſible to God, which is not only poſſible, but enjoyn'd to men.]

John 3. 16. 8. *For God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believed in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life.* [By which it appears, that God's Love is not the effect of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, but Chriſt is the proper Gift and Effect of God's Love].

Acts 10. 34. 9. *To him gave all the Prophets witneſs, that through his Name whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall receive Remiſſion of ſins.* [So that *Remiſſion* came by believing his Teſtimony, and obeying his Precepts, & not by a Slickt ſatisfaction.]

Rom. 8. 31, 32. 10. *If God be for us, who can be againſt us? He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered up for us all.*] Which evidently declares it to be God's Act of Love, otherwiſe if he muſt be paid, he ſhould be at the charge of his own ſatisfaction, for he delivered up the Son.]

2 Cor. 11. 5. 18. 19. 11. *And all things are of God, who hath reconcliedus to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt, and hath given to us the Miniſtry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Chriſt, reconciling the World unto himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes unto them.* [How undeniably apparent is it that God is ſo far from ſtanding off in high diſpleaſure, and upon his tearms, contracting with his Son for a ſatisfaction, as being otherwiſe uncapable to be reconciled, that he became himſelf the Reconciler by Chriſt, and afterwards by the Apoſtles, *his Ambaſſadors*, to whom was *committed the Miniſtry of Reconciliation.*]

Eph. 1. 7. 12. *In whom we have redemption through his Blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins, according to the riches of his Grace.* [Now what relation, ſatisfaction has to *forgiveneſs of ſins*, or how any can conſtrue Grace to be Juſtice, the meaneſt underſtanding may determine.]

1 Pet. 5. 10. 13. *But the God of all Grace, who hath called us unto his eternal Glory, by Chriſt Jeſus.* [He does not ſay that God's Juſtice, in conſideration of Chriſt's Satisfaction, acquitted us from ſins paſt, preſent, and to come, and therefore *hath called us to his eternal Glory*; but from his Grace.]

1 John 4. 9. 14. *In this was manifeſt the love of God towards us, becauſe that God ſent his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him.* [Which plainly attributes Chriſt in his Doctrine, Life, Miracles, Death, and Sufferings to God, as the Gift & Expreſſion of his Eternal Love, for the Salvation of men.]

1. In aboliſhing that other Covenant, which conſiſted in External and ſhadowy Ordinances, and that made none clean as concerning the Conſcience.

2. In promulgating his meſſage of a moſt free and univerſal tende Life and Salvation unto all that believed and followed him, (the Light) i his Righteouſneſs, the very end of his appearance being to deſtroy th works of the Devil, and which every man only comes to experiment, as he walks in a holy ſubjection to that meaſure of Light and Grace, wherewith the fulneſs hath enlightned him.

3. In

3. In ſeconding his Doctrines with Signs, Miracles, and a moſt innocent ſelf-denying life.

4. In Ratifying and Confirming all (with great love and holy reſignation) by the offering up of his Body to be crucified by wicked hands: Who is now aſcended far above all Heavens, and is thereby become a moſt compleat Captain, and perfect Example.

So that I can by no means conclude, but openly declare that the Scriptures of Truth are not only ſilent in reference to this Doctrine of *Rigid Satisfaction*, but that its altogether inconſiſtent with the Dignity of God, and very repugnant to the Conditions, Nature, and Tendency of that ſecond Covenant, concerning which their Teſtimony is ſo clear.

The Abſurdities that unavoidably follow the Compariſon of this Doctrine, with the ſence of Scripture.

1. THat God is gracious to forgive, and yet impoſſible for him, unleſs the Debt be fully ſatisfied.

2. That the finite and impotent Creature, is more capable of extending Mercy and Forgiveneſs than the Infinite and Omnipotent Creator.

3. *That God ſo loved the World he gave his only Son to ſave it*; and yet that God ſtood off in high diſpleaſure, and Chriſt gave himſelf to God as a compleat ſatisfaction to his offended Juſtice: With many more ſuch like groſs Conſequences that might be drawn.

Refuted from right Reaſon.

But if we ſhould grant a Scripture-ſilence as to the neceſſity of Chriſt's Satisfying his Fathers Juſtice, yet ſo manifeſt would be the Contradictions, and foul the Repugnances to right Reaſon, that who had not vail'd his underſtanding with the dark ſuggeſtions of unwarrantable Tradition, or contracted his Judgment to the implicit apprehenſions of ſome over-valued acquaintance, might with great facility diſcriminate to a full reſolve in this point: For admitting God to be a Creditor, or he to whom the Debt ſhould be paid, and Chriſt he that ſatisfies or payes it on the behalf of man, the Debtor; this queſtion will ariſe, Whether he paid that Debt, as God, or Man, or both (to uſe their own tearms.)

Not as God.

1. In that it divides the Unity of the God-head by two diſtinct Acts, of being Offended, and not offended; of condemning Juſtice and redeeming Mercy; of requiring a ſatisfaction, and then makinge of it.

2. Becauſe if Chriſt payes the Debt as God, then the Father and the Spirit being God, they alſo pay the Debt.

3. Since God is to be ſatisfied, and that Chriſt is God, he conſequently is to be ſatisfied; and who ſhall ſatisfie his infinite Juſtice?

4. But if Chriſt has ſatisfied God the Father, Chriſt being alſo God, 'twill follow then that he has ſatisfied himſelf, (which can't be.)

5. But ſince God the Father was once to be ſatisfied, and that it's impoſſible he ſhould do it himſelf, nor yet the Son or Spirit, becauſe the ſame God; it naturally follows that the Debt remains unpaid, and theſe Satisfactioniſts thus far are ſtill at a loſs.

Not as Man

6. The Juſtice offended, being infinite, his ſatisfaction ought to bear a proportion therewith, which Jeſus Chriſt, as Man, could never pay, he being finite, and from a finite cauſe could not proceed an infinite effect; for ſo man may be ſaid to bring forth God, ſince nothing below the Divinity it ſelf can rightly be ſtiled Infinite.

Not as God and Man.

7. For where to mediums, or middle Propoſitions, are ſingly inconſiſtent with the nature of the end for which they were at firſt propounded, their conjunction does rather augment than leſſen the difficulty of its accompliſhment; and this I am perſwaded muſt be obvious to every unbyas'd underſtanding.

But admitting one of theſe three mediums poſſible for the payment of an infinite Debt; yet, pray obſerve the moſt unworthy, and ridiculous conſequences that unavoidably will attend the impoſſibility of God's pardoning ſinners without a ſatisfaction.

Conſequences Irreligious and Irrational.

1. That it's unlawful and impoſſible for God Almighty to be Gracious and Merciful, or to pardon Tranſgreſſors; then which, what's more unworthy of God?

2. That God was inevitably compel'd to this way of ſaving men; the higheſt affront to his incontroleable Nature.

3. That it was unworthy of God to pardon, but not to inflict puniſhment on the Innocent, or require a ſatisfaction where there was nothing due.

4. It doth not only diſacknowledge the true Virtue and real Intent of Chriſt's life and death, but intirely deprives God of that praiſe which is owing to his greateſt love and goodneſs.

5. It represents the Son more kind and compassionate than the Father; whereas if both be the same God, then either the Father is as loving as the Son, or the Son as angry as the Father.

6. It robs God of the gift of his Son for our Redemption (which the Scriptures attribute to the unmerited love he had for the World) in affirming the Son purchas'd that Redemption from the Father, by the gift of himself to God as our compleat satisfaction.

7. Since Christ could not pay what was not his own, it follows that in the payment of his own, the case still remains equally grievous; Since the Debt is not hereby absolv'd or forgiven, but transfer'd only; and by consequence we are no better provided for Salvation than before, owing that now to the Son, which was once owing to the Father.

8. It no way renders man beholding, or in the least oblieg'd to God, since by their Doctrine he would not have abated us, nor did he Christ the last farthing, so that the acknowledgments are peculiarly the Sons: which destroys the whole current of Scripture-Testimony, for his good will towards men.——O the infamous portraiture this Doctrine draws of the infinite Goodness: Is this your retribution, O injurious Satisfactionists?

9. That God's Justice is satisfied for sins past, present, and to come, whereby God and Christ have lost both their power of injoyning Godliness, and prerogative of punishing Disobedience; for what is once paid, is not revokeable; and if punishment should arrest any for their Debts, it either argues a breach on God or Christ's part, or else that it has not been sufficiently solv'd, and the penalty compleatly sustain'd by another; forgetting *that every one must appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, to receive according to things done in the body*: Yea, every one must give an account of himself to God. But many more are the gross Absurdities and Blasphemies that are the genuine Fruits of this so confidently believed Doctrine of Satisfaction. *Rom.* 14. 12. 2 *Cor.* 15 10.

A Caution.

Let me advise, nay warn thee, Reader, by no means to admit an entertainment of this Principle, by whomsoever recommended; since it does not only divest the glorious God of his sovereign Power, both to pardon and punish, but as certainly insinuates a licentiousness, at least a liberty that unbecomes the nature of that antient Gospel once preached among the Primitive Saints, and that from an apprehension of a satisfaction once paid for all. Whereas I must tell thee, That unless thou seriously repent, and no more grieve God's Holy Spirit, placed in thy inmost Parts, but art thereby taught to deny all ungodliness, and lead into all Righteousness; At the Tribunal of the Great Judge thy plea shall prove invalid, and thou receive thy reward without respect to any other thing than the Deeds done in the Body: *Be not deceived, God will not be mocked; such as thou sowest, such shalt thou reap* which leads me to the consideration of my third Head, *viz.* Justification by an Imputative Righteousness. *Gal.* 6.

The Juſtification of impure Perſons, by an imputative Righteouſneſs, refuted from Scripture.

Doct. *THat there is no other way for Sinners to be juſtified in the ſight of God, than by the Imputation of that Righteouſneſs Chriſt long ſince performed Perſonally, and that Sanctification is conſequential, not antecedent.*

Ex. 23. 1 1. *Keep thee far from a falſe matter; and the Innocent and Righteous ſlay thou not; for I will not juſtifie the Wicked.* Whereon I ground this Argument, That ſince God has preſcribed an inoffenſive life, as that which only can give acceptance with him, and on the contrary hath determined never to juſtifie the wicked, then will it neceſſarily follow, that unleſs this ſo much believ'd imputative Righteouſneſs had that effectual influence, as to regenerate and redeem the Soul from ſin, on which the malidiction lies, he is as far to ſeek for Juſtification as before; for whilſt a perſon is really guilty of a falſe matter, I poſitively aſſert from the authority and force of this Scripture, they cannot be in a ſtate of Juſtification; and as God will not juſtifie the Wicked, ſo by the acknowledg'd reaſon of contraries, the Juſt he will never condemn, but they, and they only are the juſtified of God.

Prov. 17. 15. 2. *He that juſtifieth the Wicked, and he that condemneth the Juſt, even they both are an abomination to the Lord.*, [It would very opportunely be obſerv'd that if it's ſo great an abomination in men to juſtifie the Wicked, and condemn the Juſt, how much greater would it be in God, which this Doctrine of Imputative Righteouſneſs neceſarily does imply, that ſo far diſengages God from the perſon juſtified, as that his guilt ſhall not condemn him, nor his innocency juſtifie him? but will not the abomination appear greateſt of all, when God ſhall be found condemning of the Juſt, on purpoſe to juſtifie the Wicked, and that he is there to compel, or elſe no Salvation, which is the tendency of their Doctrine, *Who imagine the Righteous and Merciful God, to condemn and puniſh his Innocent Son, that he having ſatisfied for our Sins, we might be juſtified* (whilſt unſanctified) *by the imputation of his perfect Righteouſneſs.* O why ſhould this horrible thing be contended for by Chriſtians?

Ezek. 18 20. 26, 27. 28. 3. *The Son ſhall not bear the iniquity of his Father; the Righteouſneſs of the Righteous ſhall be upon him, and the wickedneſs of the wicked ſhall be upon him. When a righteous man turneth away from his Righteouſneſs, for his Iniquity that he hath done ſhall he die; again when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedneſs, and doth that which is lawful and right, he ſhall ſave his Soul alive; yet ſaith the Houſe of* Iſrael, *The Ways of the Lord are not equal; Are not my Ways equal?* If this was once equal, it's ſo ſtill, for God's unchangeable; and therefore I ſhall draw this Argument, That the condemnation or juſtification

cation of persons is not from the imputation of anothers Righteousnes, but the actual performance and keeping of God's Righteous Statutes or Commandments, otherwise God should forget to be equal: Therefore how wickedly unequal are those, who not from Scripture evidences, but their dark conjectures and interpretations of obscure passages, would frame a Doctrine so manifestly inconsistent with God's most pure and equal Nature; making him to condemn the Righteous to death, and justifie the wicked to life, from the imputation of anothers Righteousnes:—a most unequal way indeed.

4. *Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father. Whosoever heareth these saying of mine, and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a Rock*, &c. [How very fruitful are the Scriptures of Truth in Testimonies against this absurd and dangerous Doctrine; these words seem to import a two-fold Righteousnes, the first consists in Sacrifice, the last in Obedience; the one makes a talking, the other a doing Christian. I in short argue thus, If none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but they that do the Father's Will; then none are justified, but they who do the Father's Will, because none can enter into the Kingdom, but such as are justified; since therefore there can be no admittance had without performing that Righteous Will, and doing those Holy and perfect Sayings. Alas, to what value will an Imputative Righteousnes amount when a poor Soul shall awake polluted in his sin, by the hasty calls of death, to make its appearance before the Judgment Seat, where 'tis impossible to justifie the wicked, or that any should escape uncondemned, but such as do the Will of God.] Mat. 7. 21. 24. 25.

5. *If ye keep my Commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's Commandments, and abide in his love.* [From whence this Argument doth naturally arise; If none are truly justified that abide not in Christ's love, and that none abide in his love who keep not his Commandments, then consequently none are justified but such as keep his Commandments. Besides, here is the most palpable opposition to an Imputative Righteousnes that may be; for Christ is so far from telling them of such a way of being justified, as that he informs them the reason why he abode in his Father's love, was his obedience; and is so far from telling them of their being justified, whilst not abiding in his love, by virtue of his obedience imputed unto them, that unless they keep his Commands, and obey for themselves, they shall be so remote from an acceptance, as wholly to be cast out; in all which Christ is but our Example.] John 15. 10.

6. *Ye are my Friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.* [We have almost here the very words, but altogether the same matter, which affords us thus much, without being Christ's Friend, there's no being justified, but unless we keep his Commandments, it's impossible we should be his Friends; it therefore necessarily follows, that except we keep his Commandments, there is no being justified: or in short thus, If the way to be a Friend, is John 15. 14.

to

to keep the Commandments, then the way to be justified is to keep the Commandments, because none can obtain the quality of a Friend, and remain unjustified, or be truly justified, whilst an Enemy, which he certainly is, that keeps not his Commandments.]

Rom. 2. 13. 7. *For not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified.* [From whence how unanswerably may I observe, Unless we become doers of that Law, which Christ came not to destroy, but as our Example, to fulfil, we can never be justified before God; wherefore obedience is so absolutely necessary, that short of it there can be no acceptance; nor let any fancy that Christ hath so fulfill'd it for them, as to exclude their obedience from being requisite to their acceptance, but only as their Pattern, *For unless ye follow me*, saith Christ, *ye cannot be my Disciples*; and it is not only repugnant to Reason, but in this place particularly refuted; for if Christ had fulfill'd it on our behalf, and we not enabled to follow his Example, there would not be doers, but one doer only of the Law justified before God. In short, if without obedience to the Righteous Law none can be justified, then all the hearing of the Law, with but the meer imputation of anothers Righteousness, whilst actually a breaker of it, is excluded as not justifiing before God. *If you fulfil the Royal Law, ye do well; so speak ye, and so do ye, as they that shall be judg'd thereby.*]

Rom. 8. 13. 8. *If ye live after the Flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the Body, ye shall live.* [No man can be dead, and justified before God, for so He may be justified that lives after the Flesh; therefore they only can be justified that are alive; from whence this follows, If the living are justified and not the dead, and that none can live to God, but such as have mortified the deeds of the Body through the Spirit, then none can be justified but they who have mortified the deeds of the Body through the Spirit; so that Justification does not go before, but is subsequential to the mortification of lusts, and sanctification of the Soul through the Spirits operation.]

Rom. 8. 14. 9. *For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God.* [How clearly will it appear to any but a cavelling and tenatious Spirit; that man can be no farther justified, then as he becomes obedient to the Spirits leadings; for if none can be a Son of God, but he that's led by the Spirit of God, then none can be justified without being led by the Spirit of God, because none can be justified but he that is a Son of God: so that the way to Justification and Son-ship, is through obedience to the Spirits leadings, that is manifesting the holy Fruits thereof by an innocent Life and Conversation.]

Gal. 6. 7. 10. *But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoycing in himself alone, and not in another. Be not deceived, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.* [If rejoycing and acceptance with God, or the contrary, are to be reaped from the work that a man soweth, either to the Flesh or to the Spirit, then is the Doctrine of Acceptance, and ground of

Re-

Rejoycing from the works of another utterly excluded, every man reaping according to what he hath ſown, and bearing his own burden.

11. *Was not* Abraham *our Father juſtified by works, when he had offered* Iſaac *his Son upon the Altar? Ye ſee then how that by works a man is juſtified, and not by Faith only.* [He that will ſeriouſly peruſe this Chapter, ſhall doubtleſs find ſome, to whom this Epiſtle was wrote, of the ſame Spirit with the Satisfactioniſts and Imputarians of our time, they fain would have found out a Juſtification from Faith in, and the Imputation of anothers Righteouſneſs; but *James* an Apoſtle of the moſt high God, who experimentally knew what true Faith and Juſtification meant, gave them to underſtand from *Abrahams* ſelf-denying Example, that unleſs their Faith in the purity and power of God's Grace, had that effectual Operation to ſubdue every beloved luſt, wean from every *Dallila*, and intirely to reſign and ſacrifice *Iſaac* himſelf, their Faith was a Fable, or as a Body without a Spirit; and as Righteouſneſs therefore in one perſon cannot juſtifie another from unrighteouſneſs, ſo whoever now pretends to be juſtified by Faith, whilſt not led and guided by the Spirit into all the Ways of Truth, and Works of Righteouſneſs, their Faith they will find at laſt Fiction] Jam. 2. 21, 24.

12. *Little Children, let no man deceive you, he that doth Righteouſneſs, is Righteous, as God is Righteous, but he that committeth ſin is of the Devil.* From whence it may be very clearly argued, that none can be in a ſtate of Juſtification from the Righteouſneſs performed by an other imputed unto them, but as they are actually redeemed from the commiſion of ſin: For if he that commits ſin is of the Devil, then cannot any be juſtified compleatly before God, who is ſo incompleatly redeem'd, as yet, to be under the captivity of luſt; ſince then the Devil's Seed or Off-ſpring may be juſtified, but that's impoſſible; It therefore follows, that as he who doth Righteouſneſs, is Righteous, as God is Righteous; ſo no farther is he like God, or juſtifiable; for in whatſoever he derogates from the works of that Faith, which is held in a pure Conſcience, he is no longer Righteous or juſtifi'd, but under condemnation as a Tranſgreſſor, or diſobedient perſon to the Righteous Commandment; and if any would obtain the true ſtate of Juſtification, let them circumſpectly obſerve the Holy Guidings and Inſtructions of that Unction, to which the Apoſtle recommended the Antient Churches, that thereby they may be led out of all ungodlineſs into Truth and Holineſs; ſo ſhall they find acceptance with the Lord, who has determined *never to juſtifie the Wicked*]. 1 John 3. 7. 8.

Refuted from right Reaſon.

1. Becauſe it's impoſſible for God to juſtifie that which is both oppoſite and deſtructive to the purity of his own Nature, as this Doctrine neceſſarily obliges him to do in accepting the wicked, as not ſuch from the imputation of anothers Righteouſneſs.

2. Since

2. Since man was juſtified before God, whilſt in his native Innocency, and never condemned till he had err'd from that pure ſtate; he never can be juſtified, whilſt in the frequent Commiſſion of that for which the Condemnation came; therefore to be juſtifi'd, his Redemption muſt be as intire as his Fall.

3. Becauſe Sin came not by Imputation, but actual Tranſgreſſion; for God did not condemn his Creature for what he did not, but what he did, therefore muſt the Righteouſneſs be as perſonal for accep ance, otherwiſe theſe two things will neceſſarily follow, firſt, that he may be actually a Sinner, and yet not under the curſe; ſecondly, That the power of the firſt *Adam* to death, was more prevalent then the power of the ſecond *Adam* unto life.

4. It's therefore contrary to ſound reaſon, that if actual ſinning brought death and condemnation, any thing beſides actual obedience unto Righteouſneſs, ſhould bring Life and Juſtification; for Death and Life, Condemnation and Juſtification, being vaſtly oppoſite, no man can be actually dead and imputatively alive; therefore this Doctrine ſo much contended for, carries this groſs abſurdity with it, that a man may be actually ſinful, yet imputatively righteous; actually judged and condemned, yet imputatively juſtified and glorified. In ſhort, he may be actually damn d, and yet imputatively ſaved; otherwiſe it muſt be acknowledged that obedience to Juſtification ought to be as perſonally extenſive as was diſobedience to condemnation: In which real, not imputative ſenſe, thoſe various tearms of Sanctification, Righteouſneſs, Reſurrection, Life, Redemption, Juſtification, *&c.* are moſt infallibly to be underſtood?

5. Nor are their words, *Impute, Imputed, Imputeth, Imputing*, uſed in Scripture by way of application, to that which is actual and inherent, as the Aſſerters of an Imputative Righteouſneſs do by their Doctrine plainly intimate, but ſo much the contrary, as that they are never mentioned but to expreſs men really and peſonally to be that which is imputed to them, whether as guilty, as remitted, or as righteous: for inſtance; *What man ſoever of the houſe of* Iſrael *that killeth an Ox, and bringeth it not to the door of the Tabernacle, to offer unto the Lord, Blood ſhall be imputed unto that man*, or charg'd upon him as guilty thereof. *And* Shemei *ſaid unto the King, Let not my Lord impute Iniquity unto me, for thy Servaut doth know that I have ſinned.*

Lev. 17. 4.
2*Sam.* 19 18, 19, 20.

6. *But Sin is not imputed where there is no Law.* From whence it is apparent that there could be no imputation or charging of guilt upon any but ſuch as really were guilty. Next, it is uſed about Remiſſion: *Bleſſed is the manun to whom the Lord imputeth not Iniquity*; or as the foregoing words have it, *Whoſe tranſgreſſion is forgiven.* Where the non imputation doth not argue a non-reality of ſin, but the reality of God's; pardon; for otherwiſe there would be nothing to forgive, nor yet a real pardon, but only imputative, which according to the ſence of this Doctrine I call *Imaginary*. Again, *God*

Rom 5. 13
Pſ. 32. 2.

was

was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. Where also non-imputation, being a real discharge for actual trespasses, argues an imputation by the reason of contraries, to be a real charging of actual guilt. Lastly, it's used in relation to Righteousness; *Was not* Abraham *justified by works when he offered* Isaac? *and by Works was Faith made perfect, and the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness.* By which we must not conceive, as do the dark Imputarians of this age, that *Abraham's* offering personally was not a justifying Righteousness, but that God was pleased to account it so; since God never accounts a thing that which it is not; nor was there an imputation of anothers Righteousness to *Abraham*, but on the contrary, his personal obedience was the ground of that just imputation; and therefore that any should be justified from the imputation of anothers righteousness, not inherent, or actually possessed by them, is both ridiculous and dangerous: —Ridiculous, since it is to say a man is rich to the value of a thousand pounds, whilst he is not really or personally worth a groat, from the imputation of another who has it all in his possession. Dangerous, because it begets a confident perswasion in many people of their being justified, whilst in captivity to those lusts, whose reward is condemnation; whence came that usual saying amongst many Professors of Religion, *That God looks not on them as they are in themselves, but as they are in Christ*; not considering that none can be in Christ, who are not new Creatures, which those can't be reputed, who have not disrob'd themselves of their old Garments, but are still inmantled with the corruptions of the old man.

2 *Cor.* 5. 19.

Jam. 2. 21, 22, 23.

Consequences Irreligious and Irrational.

1. It makes God guilty of what the Scriptures say is an abomination, to wit, that he justifieth the wicked.

2. It makes him look upon persons as they are not, or with respect which is unworthy of his most equal Nature.

3. He is hereby at peace with the Wicked, (if justified whilst Sinners) who said, *There is no peace to the Wicked.*

4. It does only imply communion with them here, in an imperfect state, but so to all eternity, *for whom he justified, them he also glorified.* Therefore whom he justified, whilst sinners, them he also glorified whilst sinners.

Rom. 8. 30.

5. It only secures from the wages, not the dominion of sin, whereby something that is sinful becomes justified, and that which defileth, to enter God's Kingdom.

6. It renders a man justified and condemned, dead and alive, redeemed and not redeemed at the same time, the one by an imputative Righteousness, the last by a personal unrighteousness.

7. It flatters men, whilst subject to the Worlds lusts, with a state of Justification, and thereby invallids the very end of Christ's appearance, which

was to destroy the works of the Devil, and take away the sins of the World; a quite contrary purpose then what the Satisfactionists, and Imputarians of our Times have imagined, *viz.* to satisfie fortheir sins, and by his Imputed Righteousness, to represent them holy in him, whilst unholy in themselves: Therefore since it was to take away Sin, and destroy the Devil's works, which were not in himself, for that Holy *One* saw no corruption, consequently in mankind; what can therefore be concluded more evidently true, then that such in whom Sin is untaken away, and the Devil's works undestroyed, are strangers (notwithstanding their conceits) to the very end and purpose of Christ's manifestation.

Conclusion by way of Caution.

THus Reader have I led thee through those three so generally applauded Doctrines, whose confutation, I hope, though thou hast run, thou hast read; and now I call the Righteous God of Heaven to bear me Record, that I have herein sought nothing below the defence of his Unity, Mercy, and Purity against the rude and impetuous assaults of Tradition, Press and Pulpit, from whence I daily hear, what rationally induceth me to believe a conspiracy is held by Counter-plots, to obstruct the exaltation of Truth, and to betray Evangelical Doctrines, to Idle Traditions: But God will rebuke the Winds, and destruction shall attend the Enemies of his Anointed.—Mistake me not, we never have disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are ONE, but mens Inventions; for, 1. Their *Trinity* has not so much as a Foundation in the Scriptures. 2. That its Original was three hundred years after Christianity was in the World. 3. It having cost much blood, in the Council of *Sirmium*, *Anno* 355. it was Decreed, *That thenceforth the controversie should not once be remembred, because the Scriptures of God made no mention thereof.* Why then should it be mentioned now with a *Maranatha*, on all that will not bow to this abstruse Opinion. 4. And it doubtless hath occasioned Idolatry, witness the Popish Images of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. 5. It scandalizeth *Turks*, *Jews*, and *Infidels*, and palpably obstructs their reception of the Christian Doctrine. —— Nor is there more to be said on the behalf of the other two; for I can boldly challenge any person to give me one Scripture Phrase which does approach the Doctrine of Satisfaction, (much less the Name) considering to what degree it's stretched; not that we do deny, but really confess that Jesus Christ, in Life, Doctrine, and Death, fulfilled his Fathers Will, and offered up a most satisfactory Sacrifice, but not to pay God, or help him (as otherwise being unable) to save men, and for a Justification by an Imputative Righteousness, whilst not real, it's meerly an imagination, not a reality, and therefore rejected; otherwise confest and know to be justifying before God, because there is no abiding in Christ's Love without keeping his Commandments. I therefore caution thee in love, of whatsoever Tribe or Family of Religion thou mayst be, not longer to decei-

Socrat. Schol. an. 355. *Conc. Sirm. cap.* 25. *p.* 275.

thy self by the over-fond imbraces of humane apprehensions, for Divine Mysteries; but rather be informed that God hath bestowed a measure of his Grace on thee and me, to shew us *what is good, that we may obey and do it*; which if thou diligently wilt observe, thou shalt be led out of all unrighteousnes, and in thy obedience shalt thou *receive power to become a Son of God*; in which happy estate God only can be known by men, and they know themselves to be justified before him, whom experimentally to know, by Jesus Christ, is life Eternal.

A Postscript of Animadversions upon T. V's *Contradictions, delivered in his Sermon from* 1 John 5. 4. *at evening Lecture in* Spittle-Yard; For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the World.

Whatsoever Person is born of God, overcometh the World. | *There is a two fold Victory, the first Compleat, the second Incompleat.* — *Doct.*

This is as well a contradiction to his Text and Doctrine, as common sence; for besides that they neither of them say, He that's born of God, cannot perfectly overcome the World, but much the contrary; I fain would understand his intention by an incompleat victory: If he means not such a one as is obtained by the slaughter of every individual, but that which only does subdue the force and lead captive their enemies, yet will the Victory prove compleat; for if they be so far overcome as to be disarmed of farther power to mischief, the dispute is properly determined: but whatsoever is incompleat, is but overcoming, or in the way to victory, and victory is the compleating of what was before imperfect. — *Animad.*

Such overcome as are born again, who are in Christ, that have cast off the old Man, and know a change altogether new. | *Worldly Lusts can't be extirpated out of God's People in this World.* — *Cont.*

If Sin must have a place in them, how can they be born of God, and have a place in Christ, or cast off the old man, and know a change altogether new? — *Anim.*

God's Children are the greatest Conquerors; Alexander *and* Cæsar *were Conquerors, but these overcome their lusts.* | *God's Children can't perfectly overcome the lusts of the World, they sometimes take them captive.* — *Cont.*

What strange Divinity is this! that God's People should be Conquerors, and yet Captives, overcome the World, and yet be overcome thereby. — *Anim.*

Sin may tyranize over Believers. | *But not have dominion; its in captivity, it's in chains.* — *Cont.*

Who is so absolutely injurious and incontrolable, as a Tyrant? and notwithstanding that he should have no dominion, but be in captivity, and in chains — *Anim.*

chains, at best are *Bedlam* distinctions, and consequently unworthy of any mans mouth that has a share of common sence.

You must kill or be kill'd; either you must overcome the World, or the World you.

If ye fight, ye shall overcome.

2. *Incompleatly; he overcomes, when he breaks their force, leads them captive, and puts them into chains; but they are not at all slain, they sometimes take him captive.*

To kill or be kill'd, admits no middle way to escape; yet that both Sin and God's Children should lead one another captive; and that he which fights shall overcome, and yet in danger of being led captive, because incompleatly a Conqueror; to me seems very strange Doctrine.

However he goes on to tell them, *Whosoever is born of God, overcometh the lusts of the World, and he that overcometh the lusts of the World, overcomes the Devils of Hell; God's Children have to do with a conquered Enemy.* Yet he would all this while be understood in an *incompleat* sence; and to excite all to fight for this *incompleat* Victory, he recommended to their consideration the excellent rewards of Conquerors, that is, *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life, the hidden Manna. I will give him a white Stone, a new Name, Power over Nations, white Rayment*; yea, *I will make him a Pillar in the Temple of my God; he shall go no more out, and I will grant him to sit with me in my Throne.* Admirable priviledges, I acknowledg! but are they promis'd to *incompleat* Conquerors? I judge not. Reader, by this thou mayst be able to give a probable conjecture of the rest; and as I have begun with him and his Co-disputants, with them Ile end; who notwithstanding all their boasts & calumnies against us, have so evaded those many opportunities we have offered them by Letters, Verbal Messages, and Personal Visits, that had they any Zeal for their Principles, love for their Reputation, or Conscience in their Promises, they would have been induc'd to a more direct and candid Treaty.

But as it hath occasioned the publication of this little Treatise, so I am credibly informed through the too busie and malitious inquisition of some concerning it, (which have amounted to no less than positive Reports) its currantly discours'd, *How that a certain Quaker hath lately espoused the Controversie against* R. F. *and therein has perverted the Christian Religion, to that degree, as plainly to deny Christ's coming in the flesh*; with much more then was fit to be said, or is fit to be answered.

But Reader, I shall ask no other Judge to clear me from that most uncharitable accusation, since first I am altogether unacquainted with *R. F.* nor never did design directly such a thing, being unwilling to seek more Adversaries than what more nearly seek the overthrow of Truth although I doubt not but this plain and simple Treatise may prove some confutation of his Sentiments.

And lastly, as concerning Christ; although the slander is not new, yet never the less false: for I declare on the behalf of that despised People, vulgarly called *Quakers*, the Grace of which we testifie hath never taught us to acknowledge another God then he that's the *Father of all things, who fills Heaven and Earth*; Neither to confess another Lord Jesus Christ, than he that appeared so many hundred years ago, *made of a Virgin like unto us in all things, sin excepted*; or any other Doctrine than was by him declared and practised: therefore let every mouth be stopt for ever opening more, in blasphemy against God's Innocent Heritage, who in Principle, Life and Death, bear an unanimous Testimony for the only True God, True Christ, and Heavenly Doctrine, which in their Vindication is openly attested by

William Penn, *jun.*